DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 059 SP 021 688

AUTHOR Martin, Ralph E., Jr.; Wood, George H.
TITLE Two Perspectives of Early Field Experiences: Inservice and Preservice Teachers.
PUB DATE 1 Feb 83
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Teacher Educators (Orlando, FL, February 1, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; *Cooperating Teachers; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Secondary School Teachers; *Student Attitudes; Student Teacher Supervisors; Student Teaching; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS Ohio University

ABSTRACT

A study was made at Ohio University (Athens) to evaluate the perspectives of cooperating teachers and field experience students on: (1) problems cooperating teachers had in assisting field experience students; (2) help cooperating teachers received from field experience students; and (3) field experience students' perceived usefulness of the experience. A sample of 26 secondary school cooperating teachers agreed or disagreed with previous research findings which indicated that cooperating teachers believed the most pressing problems were concerned with knowing university expectations, field experience students' attendance, and field experience students' lack of teaching skills. The Ohio University sample indicated the most pressing problems as being the cooperating teachers' lack of time to spend with field experience students, lack of audiovisual and teaching skills, and field experience students' low interest in getting to know other school personnel. Field experience students ranked as the greatest problems their inability to operate audiovisual equipment, and the university's lack of knowledge of what they had done or ought to do. Cooperating teachers indicated that field experience students were of assistance in paperwork, released cooperating teachers for small group and individualized work, provided some increased student motivation, and had a positive influence on the class. Potential problem areas were identified as field experience students' passive attitudes, difficulty in placing some field experience students, and limited university involvement. Field experience students' evaluation of the experience indicated a high level of perceived attainment of the attitudes, skills, and understanding desired by the cooperating teachers. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227059

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ralph E. Martin
George H. Wood

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TWO PERSPECTIVES OF EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCES: INSERVICE AND PRESERVICE TEACHERS

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Teacher Educators
Orlando, Florida
February 1, 1983

Ralph E. Martin, Jr.
George H. Wood
School of Curriculum and Instruction
Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701

SP 021 688

Introduction

In recent years teacher education programs throughout the country have put increased emphasis upon field experiences prior to student teaching for pre-service teachers. Whether this programmatic re-direction has come from state guidelines or internal attempts at program renewal, it seems clear that field experiences will remain a vital part of teacher preparation in the near future. However, up to this point the usefulness of such efforts is largely an article of faith. In fact, research on student teaching, which might be summoned in an effort to provide justification for field experiences, often yields results that indicate such experiences serve to negate university instruction (Zeichner, 1980). It thus seems clear that research is needed into the outcomes of such experiences.

In responding to this need an evaluative and formative examination of one such teacher education program was undertaken. Initially, the research program designed was to focus upon the effects of such experiences upon the teacher candidate. However, early in the investigators' work another fruitful avenue of inquiry arose - that of the effects such field placements were having upon the site of placement, the public schools. Thus, attempts were made to investigate the success or failure of early field experiences through the eyes of both teacher candidates and inservice teachers.

The program under consideration is the Ohio University secondary education curriculum. In this program, according to new (1980) Ohio State guidelines, teacher candidates are required to obtain 600 hours of clinical and field experiences. Of these hours, 300 are obtained in the student teaching experience itself with the remainder gained

in field experiences throughout the program. Courses such experiences are linked with include an introduction to teaching and teaching tasks, adolescent growth and development, the teaching of reading in the content area, and the advanced methods courses. Of interest to the researchers' were the effects of field experiences located in the introductory and adolescent growth and development courses. The rationale for focusing on these courses relates to the fact that they appear first in the secondary education sequence. Thus, potential problems and promises are the greatest as these education neophytes venture into schools for the first time as a teacher rather than a student.

Three major questions were to provide the focus for examining the perspectives of teachers and teacher candidates with regards to field experiences. First, what did the cooperating teachers (CT) see as being problemmatic about servicing students in field experiences. Second, how much help did these same individuals feel they received from the field experience students (FES)? Third, how useful did the FES find the experience as they attempted to decide about and prepare for a career in teaching? To begin to answer these questions, survey instruments were administered to CT involved in the initial field experience and a representative sample of FES in the program. Responses were compiled and follow-up intereviews used to collaborate suspected findings.

The results of this study follow and while limited to one program, do present some interesting and instructive insights into field experiences for teacher candidates. By examining these diverse perspectives of the teacher in the field and the hopeful teacher in the university the potentialities as well as the problems of field experiences begin to emerge.

1. What do cooperating teachers perceive as problems while working with field experience students?

Lasley and Applegate (1981) conducted a survey for the State of Ohio Department of Education. The results of this survey are viewed as being an indication of how the state's population of cooperating teachers would respond to this question. The research design was modeled after earlier methods reported by Cruickshank, Kennedy, and Myers (1974), Cruickshank (1975), and Applegate (1978). The survey instrument items emerged from a collection of problem incidents of cooperating teachers -- 76 problem accounts recorded by a sample of 25 cooperating teachers working from ten of Ohio's teacher training institutions (Lasley and Applegate, 1981). The results from a second sample (N=172) drawn from another group of Ohio colleges and universities provided the rankings of 13 most prevalent problems as shown in Table 1.

A sample of 26 secondary school cooperating teachers from the Ohio University area was asked to indicate agreement or disagreement to the problem statements reported by Lasley and Applegate (1981). Rankings were compared with the state-wide sample and are provided in Table 1.

The State of Ohio survey revealed cooperating teachers believed the most pressing problems were concerned with knowing university expectations, FES attendance and tardiness, and lack of FES teaching skills. The Ohio University sample indicated the most pressing problem as being the CT's lack of time to spend with the FES. Lack of audio-visual and teaching skills and low FES interest in getting to know other classroom teachers also were highly ranked.

In addition to rankings, tests of significance were undertaken to

compare the magnitude of the problem statement means reported for each sample. Sample sizes varied considerably (N=172, 26) and homogeneity of variance was not assumed. Estimations of the standard error of difference and adjustments to the degrees of freedom to test hypotheses of equal problem statement means were based on procedures developed by Cochran and Cox as reported in Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979). Test statistics are reported in Table 2.

Significant differences between the sample means were found for 9 of 13 problem statements. The Ohio University sample means were substantially less than their state counterparts on problems dealing with university goals and objectives, FES attendance, general teaching skills, classroom readiness, supervision, professional behavior, and university assistance. Substantial differences were not noted with problem statements dealing with the operation of audio-visual equipment, CT time for the FES, interest in other teachers, and FES preparation prior to entering the classroom.

Further tests of significance were undertaken to determine if the ratings reported for the problems were truly indicative of problems existing as described. In accordance with procedures reported by Lasely and Applegate (1981), cooperating teachers were asked to respond to each problem statement by indicating their levels of agreement or disagreement. Each statement was rated on a five choice Likert scale with "Strongly Agree" being a numerically high rating (5) and "Strongly Disagree" a low (1) rating. "Undecided" responses were rated as 3.

Mean ratings for all problem statements were less than 3.000 for the cooperating teachers represented by the Ohio University sample. It was hypothesized that if the significance of these means were found to be

statistically less than 3.000 ("Undecided") then it would appear tenable to interpret these findings as an indication that these problems did not exist as perceived and reported by the cooperating teachers. Agreement that the problems existed would result in means being found significantly greater than 3.000. Hence, students t-tests were computed to determine the efficacy of our hypothesis. Means and test statistics are listed in Table 3. All problem statement means were significantly less than the null hypothesis, except statement 7. The cooperating teachers were "undecided" about the adequacy of the amount of time available to spend with their field experience students.

We were interested in how our secondary education field experience students perceived these same "problems." Sixty-seven (67) FES were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement, like the CT's. The FES were sophomore and junior students and ratings were obtained at the end of their first education course and field experience. Rankings and means are compared with those of the CT's and are listed in Table 4. Students t-tests of significance with separate variance estimates were computed by a standard SPSS program (Table 4).

The FES reported lack of university assistance, inability to operate audio-visual equipment, and the university's lack of knowledge of what they (FES) had done or ought to do as the highest ranked "problems." Statistical comparisons of the means revealed five significant differences between the CT and FES means. In each case the CT sample means were greater than the FES means: not enough time for the CT to sit down with the FES; the FES could not operate audio-visual equipment; the FES had little interest in meeting other teachers; the FES had difficulty conducting

lessons; and the FES was unable to deal with unexpected classroom situations. All told, the FES means were substantially less than "undecided" (3.000), thus indicating no real perceptions of field experience problems.

Despite an apparent lack of problems overall, some may assume the sending of "raw" recruits to observe and assist veteran teachers may place extra burdens on inservice teachers with the FES and universities benefitting at the expense of teachers. Can the presence of FES in the classroom benefit teachers? In what form may these benfits occur?

2. How much help can field experience students provide?

Justifiably, a great deal of attention is given to problems FES may cause in the classroom. While some teachers see assisting with teacher instruction as part of their professional duties, many others have a genuine concern over minimizing outside disruptions in their classroom. This preoccupation has, however, led many investigators to overlook ways in which FES may be beneficial to the public school teacher. Given diminishing resources for many school districts it is indeed appropriate, if not vital, to examine the potential positive aspects of FES intervention in the classroom.

Given these concerns CT were requested to respond to a series of questions on the assistance they received from their FES. In addition, a sample of the participating teachers were interviewed. Thus, reports were gathered on sixty-three (63) FES placed in two school districts. In the reports teachers were asked to respond to a Likert scale rating instrument (choices being Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree) to the following nine items: (1) my FES provided assistance with paperwork; (2) my FES was able to help tutor students;

(3) my FES helped motivate students; (4) my FES made small groups possible; (5) my FES made individualization possible; (6) having a FES allowed me more time for individual pupil needs; (7) my FES was more bother than he/she was worth; (8) my FES had a positive influence on the classroom; and (9) my FES had a positive influence on my teaching.

In order to interpret the survey results the questions were divided into four different, yet related, areas. The first of these was classroom mechanics, taken from the response to question number one. In this case we found that over 95% of the teachers either Agreed to Strongly Agreed that the university field experience students were able to provide assistance with their paperwork (grading, attendance, etc.) demands. (Refer to Table 5 for complete statistical analysis). Comments made by teachers when asked about this assistance mentioned materials FES made, time put in grading assignments, and time the CT saved for instructional tasks by being relieved of various management duties.

The second area the questions addressed was classroom methodology. In particular, was the teacher better able to use a variety of approaches and more able to meet the needs of particular students when the FES was available? With the teacher released from some paperwork by having available another trained adult in the classroom a greater variety of methods, especially those which stressed individualization and small groups, were used. Teachers overwhelmingly Agreed or Strongly Agreed that with the additional help they were able to use small groups more often (92%), use more individualization (89%), have more students tutored (87%), and spend more time with students with special needs (85%). Several teacher comments are useful in understanding how helpful the university

students were:

> "(Student A) was enthusiastic and very helpful when he tutored a 5th grade boy in math. His explanations were clear and he was sensitive to the child--gave lots of praise."
>
> "... made it possible for me to take small groups to the library."
>
> "With two of us in the classroom, we were able to meet the instructional needs of more of the children."
>
> "When (Student B) led class I sat with the class and worked with the slower students."

The third area observed was the ability of the FES to influence pupil learning by increasing motivation (question 3). The teachers were not as positive on this item as on others. Still 79% of them claimed that there was some increase in pupil motivation due to the FES's action. As pointed out by several teachers, motivation was limited due to the fact that the FES were not in the school all the time. However, several teachers commented that the FES was able to reach a particular pupil in their class.

Finally, teachers were queried as to the general effect the FES had upon their classes (questions 8 and 9). Again, the results were overwhelmingly positive with over 88% Agreeing or Strongly Agreeing that the FES positively influenced the teacher's actual teaching and 90% making the same claim for the effect upon the classroom in general. Comments such as the following were typical:

> "By (Student C) being foreign she gave a broader insight into education to my students. They were interested in her country."
>
> "I really enjoyed working with (Student D). She was willing and volunteered to do extra things such as making instructional games at home. She was eager to get into teaching and asked for opportunities to take over the instruction of a group. She was also eager to learn from her experience and incorporated principles learned from one teaching experience into the next one."

"I felt very good about my teaching performance--(Student E's) presence motivated me as a teacher."

"(Student F) is seriously dedicated to becoming a good teacher and her attitude and questions kept me on my toes to be a good model."

While teacher reports demonstrate that FES had an overwhelmingly positive effect on the school setting, three potential problem areas had to be continually monitored by both university and public school faculty in order to insure such results. The first of these was the occasional FES who felt he/she was merely in the school to observe and not to participate. In these cases both the FES and the teacher were frustrated as neither gained what they wanted from the experience. Another source of frustration, for university faculty in particular, was the difficulty of placing FES because some teachers felt they had little to gain and nothing to offer the FES. Given that these teachers were paid a very minimal amount for their participation, at times it was difficult to gain access to some classrooms. Finally, the public school teachers expressed concern (developed during previous interactions with university placements) that the involvement of the university faculty with the field setting would be limited (in terms of observations, visits, and the like).

These difficulties were seemingly overcome through a close partnership between the faculties of the university and the rural schools. Frequent in-service meetings were held with groups of teachers and individual teachers to inform them of the FES's capabilities and to check on progress. School administrators were enlisted to help explain to teachers the potential benefits of the field experience students. Additionally, university faculty

made weekly visits to all field sites to monitor progress continually, suggest new ways to utilize the FES and to discuss both problems and successes with the school faculty. These strategies seemed to have paid off in that when the teachers were asked if the field experience students were more bother than they were worth (Item 7) not a single teacher responded in the affirmative and more than 95% of them either Strongly Disagreed or Disagreed with that conclusion.

3. How much value did the FES place on early field experiences?

Given the acknowledged usefulness of FES in teacher classrooms, it seemed worthwhile to determine if the FES reciprocated with perceptions of value to their preparation as teachers Lasley and Applegate (1981) identified six factors which serve to describe areas of concern cooperating teachers express for field experience students. The cooperating teachers believe these areas represent key components of the field experience and FES professional preparation. Factor descriptions were used as a basis for developing 23 statements to which 67 secondary school FES were asked to respond by (1) rating the value of the statements' concepts to their teacher preparation and (2) reporting a self-assessment of their attainment of the criteria specified by the statements. Perceptions of value were selected from a 5 item Likert scale which ranged from 1 (not important) to 5 (very important). Self-assessments were similarly reported on a scale which ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Each statement was clustered around one of six factors which are named and described as follows:

Factor 1. Preparation for field experience. The FES were asked to self-assess and indicate the value of their preparation for field assign-

ments, knowledge of pupil learning patterns and behaviors, skills in lesson preparation, and curiosity about the process of becoming a teacher.

Factor 2. Understanding the partnership of teaching asked FFS to self-assess and rate the value of the importance of partnership arrangements in educating teachers, e.g., colleges, FES, teacher, and school personnel involvement.

Factor 3. Professionalism asked the FES to rate the professional responsibilities and cognizance of school norms, including being flexible and prepared to help the classroom teacher with activities.

Factor 4. FES attitudes and skills caused the FES to focus on the importance of positive relations with pupils, eagerness to assume classroom responsibilities, and skills in completing assigned tasks.

Factor 5. Enthusiasm for teaching asked the FES to rate their initiative, enjoyment, and enthusiasm when working with rural teachers and pupils.

Factor 6. Lesson planning and organization asked the FES to indicate their ability to teach, plan for instruction, organize materials, ask appropriate questions, and carry out classroom activities.

Factor means were examined to compare the FES perceptions of value and self-assessments which resulted from their field experience training. Value of the training, as measured by the FES "value" responses (means) to survey statements, was undeniably high (Table 6). The FES placed a higher value on affective components of the field experience (factors 3,4,5,2) and less value on the subject-centered and preparatory aspects of the experience (factors 1 and 6).

As shown by the self-assessment means reported in Table 7, the FES indicated a rather high level of perceived attainment of the attitudes, skills and understanding desired by cooperating teachers. For each factor the self-assessment means were lower than the value placed upon them. In general, lower self-assessment factor means were interpreted as being indicative of FES realization that this was their first training experience and additional training and experiences were needed.

The "value" means reported for each factor may be viewed as an expression of the level of attainment desired by the FES. Analysis of variance was used to test for the differences between FES self-assessment and desired attainment (value) of the factors. Only self-assessment factors 1 and 6 were found to be significantly less (Table 7) than their factor value counterparts. Factor 6, lesson planning and organization, was not stressed highly during the campus instruction since the intent was for the FES primarily to observe and assist experienced teachers. Emphasis was given to this factor during another course attended during a later quarter, still the FES seemed to indicate more planning and classroom organization skill development would have improved their field experiences. Factor 1, preparation for the field experience, seems to indicate that more advance preparation should be provided before the experience to enable better FES participation in the field setting. Some FES remarked about not understanding the pupils well enough to assist their teachers meaningfully, while others acknowledged that they thought they understood the role of a teacher, but soon realized how naively limited their viewpoints were. Overall the FES indicated that the field experience and correlated campus instruction provided a realistic opportunity for them

to learn about the profession of teaching as it exists in a school setting. Particularly noteworthy were the comments which attested to the FES personal discoveries about themselves and their preconceptions and stereotypes. Further evidence of self-discovered weaknesses and misconceptions about the role of teachers and the impact these experiences in schools has on the training of the prospective teachers can not be better stated than in the words of the FES who offered these comments:

> "Prior to my experience this quarter, I felt teaching was an 8:00 to 3:00 job with summers off and teaching students from a pre-set plan. I never thought that it took so much planning and involvement. What a false stereotype I was under!"
>
> "... I have come to realize that it takes a great amount of skill to be a good teacher, especially the skills of communication. A teacher must be able to communicate and get along with his/her students in order to be effective ... (and) having patience and a high tolerance is very important."
>
> "I need more experience in order to grow and the chance to change the things I did not like about my teaching style. My (cooperating) teacher helped me to look realistically at what I was doing."
>
> "... I am more motivated now (about becoming a teacher) than before taking this course. I realize that the possibilities for innovation and diversity in teaching are limitless. Facing the challenge of stimulating interest in my subject is challenging. My message to the students is that there <u>is</u> life beyond the 'Dukes of Hazard.'"

Conclusions and Implications

From the investigation a number of conclusions seem to present themselves. The first is that from the diverse perspectives of both students and teachers early field experiences in the teacher education curriculum seem to be beneficial. For the teacher in the field there is an opportunity to have his/her classroom work fortified by the addition of a trained assistant. For the perspective teacher there is the opportunity to find out first hand what teaching is about in order to make a decision about one's teaching

future. That is not to say that there are no limitations to the field experience. There are several problem areas which must be overcome in order for the field placement to be successful in the eyes of students and teachers:

1) Students and teachers need to structure specific time to consider how the student will be involved in the classroom.

2) Students need university expectations for the field experience to be very clearly identified.

3) Students need to be encouraged to initiate activities in the field (such as visits to a variety of classrooms, self-instruction in audio-visual use, engagement in classroom tasks) rather than waiting for assignments.

The Ohio University program has, as shown in this examination, overcome these problems. Given that this particular field experience arrangement was evaluated in its second year of implimentation the results are especially encouraging. This would seem to indicate that the close partnership developed between university and school faculty works to overcome problems found in other field experience programs. Thus, the lack of any significant problem areas being identified by either students or teachers.

Further, the close partnership, when it was extended to include FES as well, worked to enhance the usefulness of FES to the CT. While there do appear to be several instances in which FES and CT perceived problems are not in harmony with one another (Table 4), these did not seem to hinder student success (Table 5). However, this disparity does suggest several ways in which students may be better prepared to enter the field. Several of these have been mentioned above and, while not detrimental in this study, clearly need constant monitoring to ensure the program's success.

What implications can be drawn from this study? First, it seems clear that more research is needed as to the ways various participants see and benefit from the placement of pre-service teachers in the field. Almost overlooked to this point is the effect university students have on the public school students with which they interact (Wood, et. al., 1983). Such research should address variables dealing with student maturation, the placement patterns in schools (see Johnson, et. al., 1982 for such a study), student preparation, and length of experience. Given the current fiscal health of many teacher preparation institutions the temptation may be great to cut back on support for a 'frill' like field work The broader the data base in support of such programs the less likely is their fiscal demise.

Several additional implications:

1) Teacher preparation programs should work to include or expand the field component of their program prior to student teaching. From all perspectives this element of teacher preparation is both beneficial and educative.

2) In obtaining field placements for students, university faculty and staff should demonstrate a clear awareness of potential problem areas. In so doing they can frequently prevent problems before they occur.

3) Enticements for teachers to take students into their classroom should encompass more than the monetary. While such rewards are often limited the justified expectation of useful classroom assistance should be raised in order to help secure field placements. Perhaps an informal barter system, a tool often used during periods of economic uncertainty, could be instated. In exchange for placements schools could be offered services (video-taping, loans of science equipment, etc.) or faculty time (for in-services, consulting, workshops and the like).

4) Faculty should be assigned, as part of their load, time for direct field observation. If the communication with all parties necessary for successful field work is to occur

it must be initiated by university faculty on site.

5) Given the increasingly limited budgets many small school systems face they may prove to offer ideal settings for field experiences. While these locations are often overlooked, half of the data collected in this study was from small rural school districts. These data indicated student and teacher satisfaction maintained its high level in both settings.

While a number of these implications and conclusions may seem common sense to many teacher educators we believe they are worth restating with a data base behind them. As many institutions either introduce or expand their field experience components there is always the possibility that the "obvious" may be overlooked. This initial foray only begins the research needed to expand the evidence supportive of field experiences while strengthening their potential outcomes through approved implimentation.

References

Applegate, J. H. Perceived problems of secondary school students, unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1978.

Cruickshank, D. R. Teacher Problems: A more meaningful focus for inservice education, unpublished manuscript, The Ohio State University, 1975.

Cruickshank, D. R., Kennedy, J. J. and Myers, B. Perceived problems of secondary school teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 68: 155-159, 1974.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W. and Jurs, S. G. Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences, Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1979.

Johnson, D., Cox, C., Wood, G. Communication patterns and topics of single and paired student teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 1982, Spring-Summer, iv (1), 56-60.

Lasley, T. J. and Applegate, J. H. Problems of cooperating teachers for preservice field experience students, a study conducted by the division of teacher education and certification, State of Ohio, Department of Education, 1981.

Wood, G., Bates, G., Birkley, M. The effects of early field experience students on middle school students' achievement and behavior and teachers' performance. Ohio Middle Schools Journal, in press.

Zeichner, K. Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31 (6), 45-55.

Table 1

Comparison of State of Ohio and Ohio University Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of Problems: Rankings

Problem Statements	State of Ohio Cooperating Teacher (n=172) Rank	Ohio University-Secondary School Cooperating Teacher (n=26) Rank
I do not know what the college or university wants as the goals and objectives of my FES's field experiences.	1	8
My FES is often absent and/or frequently tardy.	2	13
My FES cannot operate audio-visual equipment.	3	2
My FES never asks any questions.	4	11
My FES has difficulty conducting lessons.	5	5
My FES cannot give clear and precise directions.	6	7
I never have enough time to sit down and work with my FES	7	1
My FES is unable to deal with classroom activities or situations which are unexpected.	8	6
The college/university seems to have no idea what the FES has done or ought to do.	9	10
My FES appears to have no interest in getting to know other teachers in the building.	10	3
My FES rarely prepares before he/she comes to my classroom to teach.	11	4
My FES does not behave in a professional manner when interacting with students.	12	12
The college/university provided no assistance for me in working with my FES.	13	9

Table 2

Comparison of State of Ohio and Ohio University Cooperating Teachers' Perceptions of Problems-Tests of Significance

Problem	State of Ohio (n-172) Mean	S.D.	Ohio University (n=26) Mean	S.D.	t
1	3.157	1.322	1.962	0.824	6.289*
2	3.151	1.200	1.385	0.898	8.573*
3	2.715	0.882	2.808	0.567	-0.705
4	2.593	1.053	1.692	0.788	5.208*
5	2.546	1.253	2.077	0.935	2.277*
6	2.535	0.914	2.038	0.871	2.686*
7	2.465	0.994	2.962	1.341	-1.814
8	2.419	0.930	2.038	0.824	2.165*
9	2.389	0.982	1.808	0.749	3.479*
10	2.337	1.061	2.423	1.027	-0.396
11	2.337	1.166	2.077	0.796	1.444
12	2.308	0.840	1.500	0.583	6.168*
13	2.302	1.082	1.962	0.916	1.717*

*Significant at less than the 0.05 level

Table 3

Significance of Cooperating Teacher Perceptions of Problems With Field Experience Students (n=26)

Problem Statement	CT Response (Means)	t
I do not know what the college or university wants as the goals and objectives of my FES's field experience.	1.962	-6.41*
My FES is often absent and/or frequently tardy.	1.385	-9.18*
My FES cannot operate audio-visual equipment.	2.808	-1.73*
My FES never asks any questions.	1.692	-8.44*
My FES has difficulty conducting lessons.	2.077	-5.04*
My FES cannot give clear and precise directions.	2.039	-5.43*
I never have enough time to sit down and work with my FES	2.962	-0.15
My FES is unable to deal with classroom activities or situations which are unexpected.	2.039	-5.94*
The college/university seems to have no idea what the FES has done or ought to do.	1.808	-8.11*
My FES appears to have no interest in getting to know other teachers in the building.	2.423	-2.87*
My FES rarely prepares before he/she comes to my classroom to teach.	2.077	-5.92*
My FES does not behave in a professional manner when interacting with students.	1.500	-13.16*
The college/university provided no assistance for me in working with my FES.	1.962	-5.77*

*Significant at less than the 0.05 level

Table 4

Comparison of Cooperating Teacher and Field Experience Student Problems

Problem Statements	Cooperating Teachers (n=26) Rank	Mean	Field Experience Students (n=67) Rank	Mean	t
I never have enough time to sit down and work with my FES	1	2.962	7	1.821	4.12*
My FES cannot operate audio-visual equipment.	2	2.808	2	2.194	2.50*
My FES appears to have no interest in getting to know other teachers in the building.	3	2.423	4	1.940	2.17*
My FES rarely prepares before he/she comes to my classroom to teach.	4	2.077	6	1.851	1.04
My FES has difficulty conducting lessons.	5	2.077	10	1.522	3.04*
My FES is unable to deal with classroom activities or situations which are unexpected.	6	2.038	9	1.642	2.35*
My FES cannot give clear and precise directions.	7	2.038	8	1.702	1.88*
I do not know what the college or university wants as the goals and objectives of my FES's field experiences.	8	1.962	5	2.194	0.54
The college/university provided no assistance for me in working with my FES	9	1.962	1	2.239	-1.40
The college/university seems to have no idea what the FES has done or ought to do.	10	1.808	3	2.075	-1.41
My FES never asks any questions	11	1.692	12	1.403	1.70
My FES does not behave in a professional manner when interacting with students.	12	1.500	11	1.478	0.13
My FES is often absent and/or frequently tardy.	13	1.385	13	1.269	0.67

*Significant at less than the 0.05 level

Table 5

C.T. Perceptions of F.E.S. Usefulness in the Field
(n=63)
(All percentages given in Adjusted Frequency)

Rating / Item	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Undecided	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	Mean	Median	S.D.
My FES provided positive assistance with my classroom paper work.	3.3%	0%	1.6%	32.8%	62.3%	4.508	4.697	0.829
My FES provided effective one-on-one tutoring for those students who needed it.	3.6%	3.6%	5.5%	29.1%	58.2%	4.345	4.641	1.004
My FES helped motivate some of my students.	1.8%	5.3%	14.0%	35.1%	43.9%	4.140	4.325	0.972
My FES made it possible for me to do more with small groups.	3.2%	3.2%	1.6%	40.3%	51.6%	4.339	4.531	.922
My FES made it possible for me to individualize.	3.6%	1.8%	5.5%	41.8%	47.3%	4.273	4.435	0.932
My FES made it possible for me to frequently spend more time with children who have special needs.	3.4%	3.4%	6.9%	43.1%	43.1%	4.190	4.340	0.963
My FES was more bother than he/she was worth.	72.6%	22.6%	4.8%	0%	0%	1.323	1.189	0.566
My FES, in general, was a positive influence on my classroom.	0%	0%	10.0%	43.3%	46.7%	4.367	4.423	0.663
My FES, in general, was a positive influence on my performance as a classroom teacher.	0%	0%	11.9%	54.2%	33.9%	4.220	4.203	0.645

Table 6

Rankings of Field Experience Factors

(N = 67)

Rank	Mean	Factor
1	4.64	3 - Professionalism
2	4.63	4 - Attitudes and skills
3	4.58	5 - Enthusiasm for teaching
4	4.57	2 - Understand the partnership of teaching
5	4.53	1 - Preparation for the field experience
6	4.49	6 - Planning and organization

Table 7

Comparison of Field Experience Students Self-Assessment and Perceived Values of Training

(N = 67)

Factors	Self-Assessment (Means)	Value (Means)	F
1. Preparation for field experience	3.79	4.53	8.62*
2. Understand the partnership of teaching	4.48	4.57	0.54
3. Professionalism	4.54	4.64	2.22
4. Attitudes and skills	4.48	4.63	1.00
5. Enthusiasm for teaching	4.23	4.58	3.60
6. Planning and organization	3.85	4.49	23.18*

*Significant at less than the 0.05 level